

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 2 and 4-17 were previously withdrawn.

In the Office Action of September 25, 2007, claims 1 and 3 were rejected

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 3 are amended and claim 6 is cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3 are at issue.

I. Objection To Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d).

Figures 17A and 17B are amended to accommodate the Examiner's request and overcome the objections.

No new matter was introduced in making these amendments. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these objections.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Yoshiyama et al.* (JP 07-081065 A) ("*Yoshiyama*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 recites:

“said discharge direction deflection unit generates a heat timing differential between two of said plurality of heat generation units which is effective to deflect the direction of a liquid discharged from one of the plurality of said nozzles.”

This is clearly unlike *Yoshiyama*, which fails to disclose a discharge direction deflection unit which generates a heat timing differential between two of said plurality of heat generation units which is effective to deflect the direction of a liquid discharged from one of the plurality of said nozzles. Instead, *Yoshiyama* discloses passing a liquid through a charge electrode 8, which

negatively charges the liquid, before the liquid passes through two deflecting electrodes 11 and 12 which deflect the liquid using an electrostatic field. See, Machine Translation JP 07-081065, Para. [0016]; Drawing 2.

As the Applicant's current specification teaches, by providing a discharge direction deflection unit which generates a heat timing differential between two of said plurality of heat generation units which is effective to deflect the direction of a liquid discharged from one of the plurality of said nozzles, the number of components required to deflect the liquid is reduced and the size of the head becomes smaller. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2006/0197811, Para. [0061].

Therefore, because *Yoshiyama* fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 1, the rejection cannot stand. Because claim 3 depends, either directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is allowable for at least the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 13, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000